



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

description (p. 371) of Jefferson: "The great Republican leader, from the irresponsible watch-tower of the vice presidency, had for four years watched the political chessboard with eagle eye." An eagle in a watch-tower playing chess is not bad as an attraction. It is also open to question whether a careful attention to style would include mention of the disease with which President Grant was afflicted, or of the sum received by his widow for the publication of his *Memoirs*. But these are purely matters of taste.

If one were to predict to what class this addition to American histories would be useful, he would think of the busy man who wishes condensed information in connected form; of the home library where general reading rather than intensive study is done; of the many uses to which a condensed and yet detailed description of the course of United States history could be put. Considering the difficulty of condensing and yet not omitting, one thinks of this book as Dr. Johnson thought of a woman preaching — not as being surprisingly well done, but as being done at all.

EDWIN E. SPARKS.

A School History of the United States. By PHILIP ALEXANDER BRUCE. (New York: American Book Company. 1903. Pp. 378, 36.)

A History of the United States. By WADDY THOMPSON. (Boston: D. C. Heath and Company. 1904. Pp. x, 489, xxxvi.)

THE most evident purpose of Mr. Bruce's book is use in southern schools, yet those subjects which no Northerner is supposed to be able to handle delicately enough not to hurt Southern sensibilities are treated so mildly and fairly in the main that the book might be used north of the Mason and Dixon line without offending any one. Nullification, slavery, and even secession are touched upon in such a non-committal way and so little explained that they pass almost unnoticed in the book. We have no quarrel with the author on account of his politics or sectionalism; his errors are rather of omission and emphasis and point of view.

To the principles of the Quakers Mr. Bruce gives but a clause of a brief sentence (p. 82). Of their political influence there is nothing. A sentence that a student would never notice (p. 32) is all that explains the beginning of French exploration in America. There is no account of conditions in France that influenced exploration or colonization. Bacon's Rebellion (p. 54) has no political meaning for Mr. Bruce. Champlain's fight with the Iroquois is told to liven the narrative with a fight (p. 36), but the far-reaching result is merely hinted in a manner that means nothing to one who doesn't know. The ideals and purposes of the Jesuits are not mentioned. They strut upon the stage a moment as missionaries and then they are no more. There is no hint of the dissensions between England and America until within ten pages of Lexington and Concord. For Mr. Bruce the Revolution is nothing but a fight.

The great political changes, the turning of theories into practical political experiments, are ignored. The significance of the "Conway Cabal" is not noticed; it is only a jealous intrigue by certain men. The French alliance is still, for Mr. Bruce, the work of Franklin alone, the great missionary who converted a nation; other motives there are none. The value and importance of Clark's expedition is not even suggested. The Loyalists are ignored and the state constitutions forgotten. The Confederation and state dissensions get half a page apiece, and yet in a book of 378 pages fifty are given to the American Revolution. The Whisky Insurrection has no significance for the author except that it was a riot and was quelled. On the whole there is simply the old narrative of events common to text-books of twenty years ago, with no attempt to explain the meaning of events. There is too much grouping of matter under proper names, instead of under headings indicative of the character of the action, its purpose or meaning. The student's attention is thus called to names and not to institutions, or principles, or political movements. If the South must be fed on this pabulum because it cannot endure the biased views of Northern scholars, it ought to have historical indigestion.

That the author of the *Economic History of Virginia in the Seventeenth Century* should have given us such a faulty history is surprising. Much of the result of the best scholarship devoted to American history seems unknown to him. The proportions of the work especially seem to show this fact. Again, there is almost no pedagogical apparatus, no other book is mentioned from cover to cover, and the text thus becomes the law and the gospel, though the presence of the old disproved story of Clark's capture of Kaskaskia while a dance was going on (p. 148), and other such errors of fact, convince us that the work can lay no claim to infallibility. The maps are poor, though reasonably accurate, but the pictures are absurd beyond belief. Nearly all are fanciful and in no way correct historically. Hideous, impossible Indians are shown scalping horror-stricken, unbelievable colonists; and (p. 67) a Puritan gallant dressed as if for a ball is pictured gracefully handing out of a boat the lovely Puritan maiden with curls and a pretty white apron. Nathaniel Bacon, the leader of the rebellious farmers, appears in correct costume for an English soldier of that day, and behind him are ranks of helmeted soldiers as if on dress-parade. One is taken back to the days of Ridpath by such absurd illustrations as these.

The preface to Mr. Thompson's book offers no pedagogical theory except to make the pupils "proud of an American heritage", to eliminate prejudice, and to point out "the marvelous progress of America". The author's idea of historical proportion is indicated by his opening sentence: "The chief event in American history is the war between the states." This dictum he acts upon by devoting over one-fifth of the book to that subject. Though he nowhere gives offense by ultra-Southern views, yet he suggests his state of mind (p. 407) in the assertion, "Though war never did, and never can, determine which view of a con-

troversy is right, yet it can decide that the view held by the victor shall prevail . . . Secession perished by the sword." It is needless to add that Mr. Thompson dwells with great unction upon the attempts of northern states at nullification, and his paragraph upon New England resistance to the embargo acts (p. 245) he heads "The Secession Movement Again". The book is, of course, like that by Mr. Bruce, intended for southern schools. It has many of the faults of the other, but is on the whole better. His point of view in the early period is much better. Instead of beginning with the Indians, he gets the student's mind upon Europe and the conditions there which led to the discovery of America. The Norse voyage, too, is not given such prominence as to spoil the student's measure of its importance. The omissions are in most cases of the same character as those in Mr. Bruce's work. Actual errors are not so frequent, though there are some inexcusable ones. South Carolina is said (p. 171) to have gone further than those states that had provisional governments, by adopting in March, 1776, a "complete independent government", but the preamble of the constitution itself shows that it was temporary like the others. Again (p. 206) it is asserted that in the Confederation "The affirmative vote of nine states in Congress was required for the passage of acts", but the fact is that only certain definite acts required nine votes for passage. In places the book is badly arranged, as is especially seen in some of the sequences. Without showing any relation whatsoever, the following subjects (pp. 230-232) are strung along on a chronological string: national bank, amendments, political parties, the mint, election, cotton-gin, and Indian troubles. This is but one example of sequences found throughout the book. The illustrations are much better than those in Mr. Bruce's work, and the style of writing is far more interesting.

C. H. VAN TYNE.

The Cambridge Modern History. Planned by the late LORD ACTON, LL.D. Edited by A. W. WARD, Litt.D., G. W. PROTHERO, Litt.D., and STANLEY LEATHES, M.A. Vol. II. *The Reformation.* (Cambridge: University Press; New York: The Macmillan Company. 1903. Pp. xxiv, 857.)

THE second volume of the *Cambridge Modern History* is devoted to "The Reformation". It is too bad that we find it so hard to adopt a less misleading term for the events of the first half of the sixteenth century. The expression "Reformation" fairly pullulates with popular misapprehensions, and it would seem that Lord Acton, devout Catholic as he was, would gladly have sanctioned the use of the accurate term "Protestant Revolt", or "Protestant Revolution". It is needless to say that those who contribute to the volume have in general emancipated themselves from the old conception of the Reformation, and occupy the position defined by Maurenbrecher some three decades ago in his *Studien und Skizzen*. Perhaps the best proof of this emancipation lies in the fact